

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Max Gross	Team: Team # 6	CCRB Case #: 200902980	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Thursday, 02/26/2009 3:15 PM	Location of Incident: West 147th and Amsterdam Avenue	Precinct: 30	18 Mo. SOL 8/26/2010	EO SOL 8/26/2010	
Date/Time CV Reported Thu, 02/26/2009 3:48 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Thu, 02/26/2009 3:48 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Witness(es)	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. POM Suthom Ungcharoen	26224	946349	MN IRT

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. POM Bayan Gbonoi	06816	945751	MN IRT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POM Suthom Ungcharoen	Force: PO Suthom Ungcharoen used physical force against § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b)	
B.POM Suthom Ungcharoen	Abuse: Officer Suthom Ungcharoen searched § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b)	

Synopsis

On February 26th, 2009, § 87(2)(b) filed this complaint via phone, on behalf of herself and her friend § 87(2)(b). On February 26th, 2009, at approximately 3:15pm, § 87(2)(b) was walking with § 87(2)(b) close to the intersection of West 147th Street and Amsterdam Avenue in Manhattan. § 87(2)(b) explained that the two passed by a deli located on the corner of the intersection, and spoke briefly with some people who were gathered outside. § 87(2)(b) stated she first noticed two officers, PO1 and PO2, identified by the CCRB as Officer Sunthom Ungachareon and Officer Bayan Gnob of the Manhattan North Impact Response Team, standing close by apparently watching the crowd. After § 87(2)(b) had a brief conversation with some of the individuals in front of the deli, she and § 87(2)(b) walked down 147th Street to meet § 87(2)(b).

After a brief stay inside the studio, § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) went back to the deli in order to get some food. § 87(2)(b) went inside the store and ordered a sandwich while § 87(2)(b) waited outside. At that point, the officers approached § 87(2)(b) and asked her if she could produce some identification (**Allegation A**). § 87(2)(b) was unsure why she was being questioned, and began to ask the officers what she did wrong. At that point, § 87(2)(b) emerged from the deli and the Officer Ungachareon immediately approached him asked him to produce his identification. § 87(2)(b) refused to show the Officer Ungachareon his identification, stating he did nothing wrong, at which point Officer Ungachareon grabbed him by the arm, twisted it, and pushed him up against the wall of the deli simultaneously pressing his face into the wall (**Allegation B**). Officer Ungachareon then removed § 87(2)(b)'s identification from his back pocket, before releasing him from his grip (**Allegation C**). After seeing what happened to § 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(b) complied and handed over her identification to Officer Ungachareon, but not before "speaking up" about the way § 87(2)(b) had just been shoved against the wall. At that point, PO3 and PO4, described only as a white male and an Asian female, arrived at the scene in a marked van. Officer Ungachareon and Officer Gnob then each issued § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) summonses for § 87(2)(b), before allowing them to leave the scene.

Officer Ungachareon issued a summons to § 87(2)(b) and Officer Gnob issued a summons to § 87(2)(b) and their names and tax numbers were provided to the CCRB from those summonses. Officer Ungachareon was described by both individuals as clearly an Asian male, while Officer Gnob was described by both individuals as clearly a black male; and these pedigree descriptions were confirmed by CTS. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b)'s statements both indicated that it was the Asian officer who grabbed § 87(2)(b) and pushed him up against a wall outside of the deli. On February 26th, 2008, Officer Ungachareon completed a stop-and-frisk report for § 87(2)(b) for suspicion of criminal sale of a controlled substance, although no stop-and-frisk report was completed for § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(g).

On March 3rd, 2009, both § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were contacted and they both provided brief independent phone statements concerning this incident. On that date, both individuals also agreed to come into the CCRB to provide formal statements. On March 12th, 2009, § 87(2)(b) missed her scheduled appointment at the CCRB without calling to cancel or reschedule. On March 12th, 2009, § 87(2)(b) was sent a missed appointment letter. On March 16th, 2009, § 87(2)(b) was called and a detailed message was left on her voicemail concerning her missed appointment. On March 13th, 2009, § 87(2)(b) missed his scheduled appointment at the CCRB without calling to cancel or reschedule. On March 16th, 2009, § 87(2)(b) was called concerning his missed appointment and a detailed message was left on his voicemail. § 87(2)(b) was sent a please call letter on March 3rd, 2009, and a missed appointment letter on March 13th, 2009. The first letter was returned to the CCRB stamped "return to sender", although subsequent COLES and CityMap inquiries indicated that the address he provided to the CCRB does indeed exist. To date, neither § 87(2)(b) nor § 87(2)(b) has attempted to contact the undersigned investigator. § 87(2)(g)

Investigator:

Date:

Supervisor:

Date:

Reviewed by:

Date:

Reviewed by:

Date: